CANDOUR

The British Views-Letter

Founded by A. K. Chesterton in 1953 to defend National Sovereignty against the menace of International Finance

Vol. XXXIII No. 1 *Registered at the G.P.O. as a Newspaper* January, 1982.

LABOREM EXERCENS - A DISTRIBUTIVE RESPONSE

by ANTHONY COONEY.

Pope Leo XIII 's encyclical *Rerum Novarum* was a courageous and radical document precisely because it confronted the conventional wisdom of the Nineteenth Century — the growing intellectual fad of Collectivism and the dominant fact of Liberal Capitalism. *Rerum Novarum* made explicit for the first time the alternative of Christendom's ideal — the free and lawful man living from his own property. This is the core doctrine of *Rerum Novarum*: "The Church has her negative standards, to fall below which is to fall into sin . . . . But she also has her positive standards, which are very different. . . . therefore, hours of employment, the living wage, and housing . . . have no necessary relations to a discussion of the type of society which the Church wants. For nothing is more certain than that whatever such a society resembles, it will not resemble Industrial Capitalism . . . . It is depressing that it is precisely these points of tolerability and transition which have been emphasised almost exclusively by commentators and publicists . . . . The very terms of *Rerum Novarum* make it clear that the Pope envisaged something very much like the ultimate supercession of Industrial Capitalism. If not, much of the document has no meaning. The Encyclical teems with such indications. Thus: 'A yoke little better than slavery itself' . . . . Therefore he cannot be alluding chiefly to low wages, but to the *essential* yoke of capitalism" (Harold Robins — "The Sun of Justice" in *The Cross and the Plough,* published by the Catholic Land League).

Forty years after *Rerum Novarum,* Pope Pius XI issued a second social encyclical. *Quadragesimo Anno* reaffirmed in trenchant terms the Church's doctrine of private property and repudiated the claims that they were "impractical". The encyclical then discussed developments since *Rerum Novarum,* repeating the condemnation of Socialism which, following its own internal logic where it led, had regurgitated Marx-Leninism, and of Capitalism from which the Managerial Revolution was emerging: "This domination is most powerfully exercised by those who, because they hold and control money, also govern credit and determine its allotment . . . so that no-one can breathe against their will [para. 106] . . . . a no less noxious and detestable internationalism . . . . in financial affairs [para. 109]". *Quadragesimo Anno* also dealt briefly with and warned against the new phenomenon of Fascism.

Hybrid Character

Such is the authority of *Rerum Novarum* that Popes since its publication have felt obliged to follow its pattern of enunciating doctrine and proposing "points of tolerability and transition." *Quadragesimo Anno,* although a necessary response to Twentieth Century developments, also gave rise to the idea that there was a necessity periodically to "update" *Rerum Novarum.* Such updating can only result in a dilution of the core teaching of *Rerum Novarum* by an appeasement of current conventional wisdom. This then is the background of *Laborem Exercens,* and it is necessary to understand this background to understand its hybrid character; part thesis enuniciating a doctrine, part directive, stating the tolerable minimum conditions of social life. A genuine criticism must begin with the fact that it disappoints in its treatment of its titular theme — *human work..* It disappoints because of an incredible confusion of two concepts, "Work" and "Employment". If it were not evident that the encyclical is the result of long consideration it might be supposed that this confusion arises from hasty and ill-considered thought. The only explanation for it is that the failure to distinguish between these two things is an appeasement of the conventional wisdom of "full employment".

Now it is true that a more profound and philosophical examination of the mystery of human creativity than was possible at the time of *Rerum Novarum* is vitally necessary today when the science of cybernetics has outdated the economic concept of "employment". Here, indeed, was a field where it was opportune to "update" *Rerum Novarum* and it is tragic that so important a document as *Laborem Exercens* has fudged the issue. The encyclical starts from the great mystery of human creativity as participation in the Divine activity of *Creation,* which, being outside the limitations of time and space, is both complete and continuing: "My Father worketh until now, and I work." This participation of Man in the activity of Creation is ordained by the

Divine command "Subdue the earth". Since wasps, bees, ants and spiders manifestly "work" the Divine decree must refer to work of a different order, to the creative work by which Man's *purpose*, the locus of his becoming is incarnated, first in a body, and then in the artifacts and processes by which he extends his Purpose through matter and time in the ordering ("subduing") of his environment. This is a sublime concept, loftier than *Rerum Novarum's* insistence upon the dignity of work. However, the Pope also appeals to the words "By the sweat of thy brow shalt thou eat thy bread" to justify the argument that *subsistence* work is *imposed* upon Man by Divine Decree. This indeed may be the case — the Pope would be a better judge of this than I — but it is not a case which is evident from the texts appealed to. The command to "Subdue the earth" is given before the Fall and is part of a blessing. The words "By the sweat of thy brow . . . "are spoken after the Fall and are part of a curse. Now it so happens that Pope Pius XII has illumined our understanding of this curse. In commending the work in the field of painless childbirth of Grantly Dick Reid, Pope Pius XII made clear that the words "In sorrow and in pain . . . "were not a *malediction* but a prophecy — God was simply saying that this would be the result of sin. But the words "In sorrow and in pain . . . "are part of the same utterance as "By the sweat of thy brow . . . "and therefore these words also must be prophetic and not maledictory — it is the fruits of sin, human avarice and greed which impose greater than necessary subsistence upon Man. As the encyclical closely relates subsistence work "by the sweat of thy brow" with the Fall, it is valid to draw a comparison between the Catholic doctrine of Original Sin as a flaw in human nature and the Calvinist doctrine of Original Sin as the total depravity of Man. In the same way a Catholic "Doctrine of Work" must distinguish between the sufficient penalty ("the sweat of the brow") imposed by Nature upon Fallen Man in return for livelihood, and the Protestant "Work Ethic" which is a contributary source of Capitalism. This the encyclical does not appear to do.

The confusion of these two sorts of work — work as spiritual expression, whether in the building of a house, the cultivation of a garden or the making of a song, and work for subsistence, is the source of the appeasement of the conventional wisdom of "full employment". However, we must at this point remember what was remarked about *Rerum Novarum*, that it states negative as well as positive standards. *Laborem Exercense* does, in fact, make the point that "employment" is the conventional means by which men exercise work and receive subsistence; it is concerned, therefore, to deal with the tolerable and immediate conditions thus created. Unfortunately, as with *Rerum Novarum*, it is this aspect which has already been seized upon by ecclesial publicists, both clerical and lay. An outstanding example of this is the press misrepresentation of the encyclical as citing "Christ the Worker". The phrase "the workers" has gathered accretions of Marxist meaning which make it mean something utterly different to "working men". Yet it is precisely the latter phrase which the encyclical uses in teaching a "spirituality of work" — "Therefore this was also 'the gospel of work' because *He who proclaimed it was Himself a man of work*, a craftsman like Joseph of Nazareth." Christ worked, yes, but as a Master-craftsman, a *propietor*. If Christ is to be taken as a social model, He is the model of *Rerum Novarum's* ideal — the skilled craftsman, master of his own work through his ownership of small property.

Considered from a materialist point of view — and the concept of "employment" is purely and entirely materialist — there is nothing dignified about much industrial work. Only the "spirituality of work," called for in the encyclical, can in fact dignify subsistence work, *but* it is the work which is dignified by the person, not the toil which dignifies. "Employment" in contrast is a social convention, not a Divine Decree. If we were to use short words we would not be deceived for a moment; when we speak of "employment we in fact mean *wage-service*. Employment is simply a constraint to toil; to do that which we would not do if we had choice. In a cybernetic economy, it has almost nothing to do with Man as "the subject of work'; it is simply a political device for distributing purchasing power.

The Essential Key?

Pope John Paul II emphasises that *Laborem Exercens* is not intended to touch upon all the aspects of social doctrine covered in *Rerum Novarum*, but to highlight the doctrine of work as "a key , probably the essential key, to the whole social question". This Response has, therefore, concentrated only upon what the encyclical teaches about the nature of work and upon the unfortunate confusion of work with "employment". Because of the limitations of space, what may be thought of as the encyclical's treatment of exigencies — migrant workers, socialisation, etc. — has been left aside, though not because there is not an abundance of comparative material to be set against them. Part of the problem in responding to the encyclical is that quite apart from its hybrid character, its language has nuances of meaning derived from Phenomenology, a new school of philosophy in which the

Pope is a master, but the language of which is unfamiliar to those whose acquaintance is with Scholasticism. This is especially true of the Pope's presentation of Man as the "subject of work" in contrast to the false notions of Marxism and Economism of Man as the "object of work". A matter of particular regret is that the Pope leaves out altogether any consideration of the nature and origin of money; yet surely the monetary system is the key to the understanding of a monetary economy? In fact, many of the "exigencies" the Pope deals with *exist solely in monetary unreality.* When, however, the exigencies have been distinguished and the Phenomenological terms translated, what indeed emerges is a re-affirmation, with development, of the Catholic doctrine familiar to any Distributist, which might be summarised as follows:

1. The making of things is not simply an "economic" activity, but a human activity; that there exists an organic relationship between the maker and the object, and the organisation of production must be based upon this fact.
2. That men are socialised by their family and National community into their human identity, and the Nation, therefore, constitutes the natural unit of mankind.

CUT AND THRUST

by ROBERT BLAKE

MR. PRIOR'S WARM "WELCOME" — A year or so ago *Candour's* Editor declared to readers that our present dilemma demands war, not politics. "It is the art of the *im*possible we have to learn," she wrote. "Therefore, let us make war on want of loyalty." It was in this pugnacious, patriotic spirit that an angry, jeering group of Ulster Loyalists went for Mr. Prior, the Secretary of State for Northern Ireland, during his hypocritical appearance at the funeral of the Rev. Robert Bradford. They kicked and punched at Mr. Prior, shouting "Murderer, you are the murderer," and for several chaotic minutes he was confronted with scenes which exemplified the wrath of the Ulster people, sickened by thirteen years of Westminster's appeasement and barely-concealed cowardice in the face of Republican treason. The Rev. Ian Paisley, who read the lesson at Mr. Bradford's funeral service, later affirmed that the attack on Mr. Prior was merely a "storm-warning". If his words are meant to be taken as a forecast of the reception that all politicians may now expect in the province, I commend him for endeavouring to see that they are made *personally* accountable for their betrayals. While I might not agree with Mr. Paisley's actual methods — I think a bag of soot or horse-manure would be a far more appropriate weapon of ridicule and *certainly* an unceasing verbal barrage wherever they show their faces — he is right in his strategy in inferring that only by raising such a hornets' nest under any public man who is less than unequivocal on the necessity of crushing the I.R.A. can pressure be brought to bear to allow the Army to take the initiative and end the farcical situation of a one-sided war being fought.

Britain's gutter-press subjected the Rev. Paisley (for whom, incidentally, I hold no religious brief; it is his *political* principles for which I have admiration) to the expected treatment. *The Sun's* glaring banner-headline, typical of several, read "The Gospel of Hate" (well, *shouldn't* we hate our enemies' deeds?) above a lead-story which could easily have tempted the unthinking reader into believing that it is Mr. Paisley and the Loyalist community who are responsible for the bombings, murders and other atrocities plaguing Ulster. I find such abuse quite extraordinary, for all the Rev. Paisley is doing is arguing with force and will that Mrs. Thatcher's Government cannot flout the majority wishes of Ulster's population beyond a certain limit and that the pledge of successive governments to maintain the province's constitutional integrity should be treated seriously. I suspect it is the *lack* of force and will in the characters of our sickeningly liberal "leaders" and opinion-moulders that partly accounts for the Loyalist cause seeming so objectionable. But I would not discount another factor: that many of them share as their long-term goal the establishment of an all-Ireland, de-Christianised, permissive state as their "final solution" to the Irish question, and regard with horror the almighty obstacle that the Paisleyites pose to its attainment.

THE CHURCH AND THE I.R.A. — One of the few encouraging signs in Ulster's battle against terrorism is Cardinal Thomas Fee's clear pronouncement that it is a mortal sin for any Catholic to give aid and comfort knowingly to the Provisional I.R.A., particularly in view of the fact that only last summer we witnessed the disgraceful spectacle of him pleading with the Government to capitulate to the demands of the hunger-strikers following the welcome demise of the first of their number. It would be

pleasing to think that the most recent atrocities in London and Ulster have at last pushed the Roman Catholic Hierarchy in Ireland into taking cognisance of the fact that the I.R.A. and their supporters are not "nationalist freedom-fighters" or "protectors of the Catholic population", but bloody-handed Marxist-Leninist traitors whose intention is to set up a Cuban-style "workers' republic" in which the only established position the Church would occupy would be behind the barbed wire of a concentration camp. Will Cardinal Fee now take the logical step of ex-communicating I.R.A. members and supporters? Such a sentence would not deter the hard-core Provisionals, but as a correspondent in *The Times* pointed out, it might just impress the less fanatic, it would certainly deter the great majority of Catholics who, forced with a choice, would not be prepared to put their immortal souls at risk, and more than anything else could well put an end to the easy raising of funds for the I.R.A. from sentimental and ignorant Irish Americans. I hope the Cardinal will grasp the nettle soon, as time is fast running out.

FOR MOSCOW OR FOR CHRIST? — The Vatican will be playing a very dangerous game with Moscow if the mooted visit there by Pope John Paul II goes ahead. According to Mr. Alexei Arbator of the Soviet Institute of International Relations (Moscow's Chatham House?), who was speaking at the World Council of Churches' "peace" congress in Amsterdam, there would be no official objection to a papal visit. The Pope's comment that he is "quite ready to go anywhere" indicates how far down the road of compromise with its enemies the Church has travelled since Pope Leo XIII ordered priests to recite at the end of the Mass each day the prayer for the conversion of Russia. In how many churches is it heard today? This urgent prayer has been scandalously abandoned in favour of the *modus vivendi* with Moscow at which the Vatican has found it expedient to arrive. Communism is now recognised as a reality in the modern world instead of something "intrinsically evil", as Pope Pius XI described it in his encyclical *Divini Redemptoris,* to which "no-one who desires to save Christian civilisation from extinction should render . . . assistance in any enterprise whatever."

The precise "assistance" which the Vatican would render Moscow by a papal visit would be an explicit acknowledgement of the supremacy of the Russian Orthodox Church, a schismatic church which works hand-in-glove with the Kremlin and has acted in the service of its Bolshevik masters since 1917. Since the Second Vatican Council, no word has been advanced that might risk offence to the ears of the Orthodox and in 1979 the Pope exchanged cordial greetings with Pimen, Patriarch of Moscow (who is regarded by the Kremlin as one of its loyal and trusted collaborators), despite warnings that anything that aids its supremacy militates against the continuing heroic resistance to Communist tyranny by those Christians behind the Iron Curtain who still regard themselves as united with Rome. In the Ukraine, especially, an estimated four million are loyal to Rome, even though millions more have died, been imprisoned or deported to the Arctic wastes as a result of persecution and even though their Hierarchy has been dissolved by the Kremlin and "merged" with the Orthodox Church. The Catholic weekly, *The Universe,* seems to think the Pope's presence in the Soviet capital will give them heart. That is a very curious view, for in remaining wilfully silent about their tragedy, the Vatican is acting as if these martyrs are an embarrassment to its ecumenistic diplomacy with Orthodoxy.

Indeed, the Abbé de Nantes goes so far in his latest newsletter as to suggest, backed with documentary evidence, that Rome is actively preparing to disown the Ukrainians. If the Prospect of a papal visit instils *any* feeling in Russia's faithful Catholics, it must be the thought that they are back in the days of the catacombs. As for the Kremlin, it would be only too delighted to confirm the Pope's visit as acceptance of its entire *spiritual,* as well as temporal, control over the Russian people.

A RARE INDIVIDUAL - I have great admiration for the fearlessness with which Solidarity's leader, Lech Walesa, has withstood years of sackings, of harassment by the political police and nearly one hundred spells of imprisonment. This brave man is also a profound thinker, as is seen by the answer he gave to the question of whether Communism has failed. "If you chose the example of what we Poles have in our pockets and in our shops," he said, "then I answer that Communism has done very little for us. If you choose the example of what is in our souls, then I answer that Communism has done very much for us. In fact, our souls contain exactly the opposite of what they wanted. They wanted us to be materialistic and incapable of sacrifices: we are anti-materialistic, capable of sacrifice. They wanted us to be afraid of the tanks, the guns and instead we didn't fear them at all." We in the West should find inspiration in Walesa's words for our own struggle against the intrinsic evil of Communism.

A MATTER OF DIPLOMACY — The King David Hotel in Jerusalem was taken over one day last September by a brood of the most bloody terrorists in history, when old hands of the Irgun Zwei Leumi turned up for a reception for a new

book on their bombing of the Hotel in 1946. The woman who alleges that she telephoned a warning (no record can be traced that it was ever made) was there, according to the *International Herald Tribune,* as were the creatures who brought the explosives into Jerusalem and set the fuse. In the explosion that followed, ninety-one people were hideously massacred and many more were injured. Only Irgun's sadistic leader failed to show his face at the reception — Menachem Begin. Understandably, when he spends all his time abusing the Palestinians as "callous butchers and all the rest of it, his international credibility might suffer a bit by accepting such an invitation

Palestine's scarred and tragic history makes sensitive reading in certain quarters, as the directors of the medical magazine, *World Medicine,* discovered after publishing their October number which carried an article referring to Begin's part in the destruction of Deir Yassin. The writer, Mr. Karl Sabbagh, addressed himself to all doctors going to the Medical Olympics in Israel and made the quite legitimate point that when they were taken round the country they should remember how it was set up. His family had lived in Palestine until 1948, he stated, and he felt his comments on Begin's past were relevant in exposing as false the Israeli leader's declared commitment to a peaceful solution in the Middle East. The evidence that years after Deir Yassin, the monster Begin's election addresses boasted how his "freedom fighters" (who coldly slaughtered with grenades, rifles and bayonets 254 helpless villagers, including pregnant women whose stomachs were slit open and the unborn children butchered) forced the headlong flight of 400,000 Arabs out of Israel was not sufficient to impress the Israel Medical Association. This body — which, for some odd reason, is based in London — decided to write to drug companies and other advertisers in *World Medicine* suggesting that they withdrew their custom until an assurance is given that the magazine will "never again publish blatant Palestine Liberation Organisation propaganda". It would be illuminating to be informed what description these gentlemen would apply to the testimony of the International Red Cross, whose representatives personally fished nearly 150 lifeless Arab bodies from Deir Yassin's village well.

RACISTS AND RACISTS — One of the bright ideas devised by the public nuisances on the Commision for Racial Equality is that a new criminal offence of racial harassment should be introduced. My usual view of the Home Secretary is that he is as effective as the proverbial one-legged man at an arse-kicking party. But to his rare credit, Mr. Whitelaw rejected the suggestion. Perhaps in light of successive Metropolitan Police statistics regarding attacks on the elderly, female and frail, he is concerned that not all the persons arrested might be the "right" kind of racist!

This demand by the Commission underlines the blandness and dishonesty of the public debate surrounding Lord Scarman's Report. The learned judge's effusion of liberal sentiment echoed the beatitudes of all those in the establishment parties who will not face up to the muggers and rioters, displaying a smug yet uncivilised tolerance of their conduct and excusing it on the grounds of "under achievement", "lack of opportunity", 'institutional racism", "racial harassment" and countless other spurious reasons. Criticism of police attitudes is a strong theme in the Scarmen Report, which seems to suggest that even though in their daily duty they find one section of the community is responsible for by far the highest percentage of certain types of crime in a particular area, their search for culprits should not lead them towards that section. Playing down the racial problem in this country or foisting the blame for it on to the indigenous population is no solution. For unless our rulers clear their minds and cast aside their guilt-ridden liberal consciences, the problem will get steadily and catastrophically worse.

THE HA-HA MAN REPORT

O dear deprived minority
They stare at you — unlovingly,
Some even laugh within your ken
Small wonder you should rage at them
And in a passion of hurt pride,
Patience exhausted, you decide
To riot and assault the law
With petrol bomb in civil war
And looting — just an after-thought —
To have the lesson surely taught
That there must be immunity
For the deprived minority —
The men gone bald — from loss of hair
And who insist "It is not fair!"

The riot act is all the rage
The fatties next to take the stage
Their *bona fides* first connived
In case there's wonder at 'deprived'?
And riot squads get so confused
That in their turn they claim "Ill-used!"

B. E. BIGGS.

We very much regret to record the death in Western Australia of **Mr. Fred Jones,** a faithful and generous supporter of *Candour* over many years.

LIBERTY *OR* EQUALITY

by ELIZABETH, LADY FREEMAN, M.B.E.

Many reasons, from social deprivation to decline of religion, have been advanced for what must surely be the greatest problem of our age — worldwide breakdown of law and order; yet the media have paid scant attention to what must be the principal cause: the cult of equality.

Kuehnelt-Leddihn, some thirty years ago, in a book entitled *Liberty or Equality*, pointed out that you cannot have both since they are mutually exclusive, and that each triumph for "democracy" has ended, on the Continent, with a frightening set-back for the cause of liberty. Yet today the false principles of the French Revolution are riding high, mindless mobs are thronging the streets, screaming for freedom from this, that or the other, and at the same time demanding equality of sex, of opportunity, of pay (regardless of capability), of rights (regardless of duties). Conveniently forgotten is the lesson in the Book of Common Prayer that in God's service is perfect freedom. Far more people have been imprisoned for Liberty, degraded and humiliated for the sake of Equality, and tortured and murdered in the name of Fraternity in the last fifty years than in the previous thousand under less hypocritical forms of despotism.

What has happened to the independence and courage of pre-war Britons? What or who is responsible for our country's craven, guilt-ridden attitude deriding the great achievements of former generations, sympathising with failure, disparaging success and making no distinction between good and evil, honour and treason? What is it that has caused the proliferation of hooliganism, violence and murder? What is the basic cause of our degeneration into a third or fourth-class power, earning and deserving the contempt of erstwhile hewers of wood and drawers of water?

Englishmen used to pride themselves on their sympathy for the under-dog; but now that the under-dog has become top-dog they continue to make excuses for him on the plea of human rights, social justice, progress, new thinking and all the demoralising clichés going to make up "world opinion" today. "World opinion" is manufactured by the powerful opinion-makers who have their own axe to grind, and sucked up like a sponge by a craven, brainwashed public, no longer capable of thinking for themselves.

This swift descent of Avernus has accompanied the rise of the equalitarian dogma. The "sovereignty", of the unqualified", the disparagement of the superior and fawning on the inferior, has meant that both good and bad have lost respect for virtue. Capacity for leadership has dwindled, tolerance of evil increased. Emasculation of those values which helped to create Western civilisation has ensured its decline and ultimate collapse. If education is conducted on the lines that Jack is as good as his master, authority will go by the board. If people are told incessantly that everything our forefathers achieved was a matter of chance or environment, that the poverty and backward condition of other people and races is due to ill luck, that individual capacity, hard work and responsibility do not matter, that if a man commits a crime it is not his fault but because he is "deprived" and needs "remedial treatment" that you *can* make a silk purse out of a sow's ear — then values are bound to change, and the change will be apparent throughout the family, the community and the nation.

Distinction and discrimination are now dirty words. In condemning the concept of inferiority, our society has had to destroy the concept of superiority, for one cannot exist without the other.

Living A Lie

The twentieth century world is living a lie — a lie which is contradicted by the natural law. Spengler noted that society is based on the inequality of men. "This is a fact of nature. There are all sorts of temperaments; strong and weak, creative and uncreative, honourable, lazy, ambitious, quiet, those suited to leadership and those unsuited to it. Each one has a place in the organisation of the whole. The more important a culture is, and the more closely it resembles an organism, the greater the diversity in its constructive elements . . ." Dobbs wrote: "Egalitarianism is literally a doctrine of death, and so long as life stirs it is denied. This is why rivers of blood and hatred have been poured out in the name of *e-quality*, which is the denial of the *qualities* of others." Human equality only becomes true in death, the great leveller.

To debunk the equalitarian dogma is to knock the bottom out of both Communism and Socialism. Neither could survive without it, both doctrines depending on supposedly unwarranted economic and social inequalities among people. Recognition that many inequalities are biologically constituted and, consequently, inevitable cuts at the root of every left-wing doctrine. That great anthropologist Gayre of Gayre pointed out that a dogma which denies any

natural superiority to those who succeed under freedom is essential for those seeking to re-make the world on Procrustean lines, changing both social and economical circumstances of men. "Without such a theory, the collectivist movements of our time are reduced to a series of conspiracies to punish excellence and deny to mankind its highest potential. That is a little harder to sell than slogans proclaiming 'equality', 'justice' and 'the brotherhood of man'.

What can de done? Two generations of false indoctrination must be overcome; men must regain the courage to tell the truth. For truth, "the first casualty of war", has become a major casualty of the twentieth century. The current orthodoxy of liberalism, which all "right-thinking" people accept without question, must be challenged — though those who challenge it find themselves silenced with surprising effectiveness. But social destruction cannot be passed off on *enlightened* people as social justice. Injustice results as much from treating unequals equally as from treating equals unequally, as Aristotle said. The *order* which is necessary to human life must be either voluntarily kept or compulsorily enforced. The stark choice lies between religion and morality or slavery under a police state and a return to the dark ages. Truth alone can set us free.

A CHANCE TO STRIKE A WINNING BLOW

by JOHN MITCHELL

A monograph by Marguerite Pedersen, *Censorship in the U.S. — I Accuse the Jews,* describes how the author (a publisher) experiences both open and surrepitious censorship in the book industry and in the media generally, and how the control thus exercised effectively curbs free speech among ordinary people, politicians and senior Service personnel. Another pamphlet, also emanating from the U.S.A., received by me within a few days of the monograph, contains, as its title indicates, *The Confessions of the Jew Harold Wallace Rosenthal,* who occupies an influential position in the publishing world.

Rosenthal does not mince words about either where the power of the Jews lies or the purpose to which it is put: "Our power has been created by the manipulation of the national monetary system." That is where the power has its source. And the purpose: "Money power was essential in carrying out our master plan of international conquest through propaganda." Remove the course of their power, and you destroy the master plan. "By controlling the banking system," says Rosenthal, "we were able to control corporation capital . . . we extend book credit, which we create from nothing, to all local banks who are member banks. They, in turn, extend book credit to industry. Thus we do more than God, for all our wealth is created from nothing."

The degree of menace which that control means to the West may be gauged by what Rosenthal says about Soviet Russia: "There are about six to seven million communists in Soviet Russia. Fifty per cent are Jews and about fifty per cent gentile — but the gentiles are not trusted — about every five or six years the secret Jewish Board calls for the purge of the Party and many are liquidated . . . Russian communists have a Secret Group Order which consists of Jews only. They rule over everything pertaining to the visible government. It was this powerful organisation that was responsible for the secret removal of the centre of communism to Tel Aviv from where all instructions originate."

The question arises — what can be done to defeat the "master plan" of world conquest? Any reasonably intelligent person should be able to realise that you cannot defeat massive propaganda backed by mammoth money power with propaganda backed by miniscule money power. And Rosenthal ridicules such an idea by saying, "No letter, editorial or book has ever rallied the people or stopped tyranny." And he makes it abundantly clear that there is no hope of defeating the "master plan" by any form of appeal to them, whether it be termed "grass roots", referenda or the ballot-box democracy decisions of an anonymous, irresponsible electorate. Take note of this: "There is no such thing as the silent majority because *we control their hue and cry*. The only thing that exists is an unthinking majority and unthinking they will remain . . ."

In this matter there is no room for equivocation. Movements based on recruiting a *mass* response by propaganda or party politics are playing the enemy's game.

Three Factors

I have said it elsewhere, and I say it again here: there are three factors in the present situation which need to be taken careful note of and which taken

together offer the possibility — a real possibility — that this evil conspiracy can be defeated. Going along with a movement, idea or line of action because of the immediate benefits it brings is one thing. But when that path is seen to be approaching the edge of a precipice, going along with it is another matter. The nature of the precipice was spelt out by Lord Gladwyn in a letter in *The Daily Telegraph* on November 9th. He said: "The Russians almost certainly do not want to have any war . . . What they want is the withdrawal of American troops from Europe and the installation in Bonn, London, Paris and Rome of pro-Soviet governments . . . If the slump goes on they may achieve this end." If anyone should be in any doubt what that means, Harold Rosenthal is not: "It is an established rule to destroy all members of pre-existing government, their families and relatives, but never Jews."

A less calamitous precipice, but one more immediately alarming and clearly understood, takes the form of electoral defeat if a transformation is not effected in the economy in the next year or so.

The second factor is the threshold of moral turpitude below which even politicians are not prepared to go. For this to apply, obviously the issue must be clear beyond a doubt.

The third factor consists in making this issue clear beyond doubt to all politicians. And that factor is something which readers of this Views-Letter can help to create. Following this article will be found the text of a letter to the Treasury. The Treasury has made vital admissions about those same bank book credits which Mr. Rosenthal has referred to as giving the Money Power the gift of doing "more than God" by creating "wealth from nothing", the source of the power behind the Jews' "master plan" for world conquest.

Crucial Question

The letter/leaflet enclosed with the last issue of *Candour* contained a QUESTION. It asked why these book credits should not be used on a *non-repayable* basis to pay for at least part of Government expenditure in lieu of V.A.T. What, after admitting making false statements, the Treasury has done is to agree that in actual experience (not theory) over a long period in West Germany, Japan and Switzerland large additions of *non-repayable* consumer purchasing power have co-existed with constant low inflation rates and high output. And they have also agreed that in the United Kingdom large additions of *repayable* consumer purchasing power have co-existed over a long period with high inflation rates and relatively low output. No-one can point to any exceptions to these rules.

The issue has thus been made plain and put absolutely beyond dispute. The urgent need now is to bring this issue to the attention of all politicians, and to keep their attention on it. As they cannot dispute the truth of what the Treasury has agreed, if they don't act to remedy the situation they will, in effect, proclaim themselves traitors to their country.

It is important also to note that the Treasury has made two other admissions. The first is that West Germany, Japan and Switzerland have got their additions of *non-repayable* purchasing power through a successful fight for export markets — a fundamental cause of war. The second is that the British Government has embarked on that same battle for a surplus of exports over imports, thus also promoting a fundamental cause of war, when they could obtain the *non-repayable* purchasing power by ordering the Bank of England to provide it.

URGENT ACTION NOW: Write to your M.P. about this, enclosing the letter to the Treasury or a photostat of it.

* * * *

This is the text of Mr. Mitchell's letter to C. D. Harrison, Esq., at Treasury Chambers, Parliament Street, London SW1, dated 23rd November.

Thank you for your letter of 18th November. I am glad to see that we are making progress. The position is now:

1. *Your false statement:* Referring to bank creation of money by mere book entries as "printing money". *Your first admission:* para. 1, point (2) — it *is* a misnomer for this process to be called "printing money".

2. *Your false statement:* "Bank loans represent the savings of individuals and companies." *Your second admission:* "Money is created by Government borrowing from the banking system."

3. *Your false statement:* "Any general increase in demand (i.e. purchasing power) will . . . drive up the overall price level." *Your third admission:* para 4, your letter: *"Both* low inflation and strong external payments balances (*non-repayable* addition to purchasing power) have been the result of a strong and competitive industrial base."

Now, Mr. Harrison, the competitive production in West Germany, Japan and Switzerland undoubtedly *attracted* the extra purchasing power from the economies of other nations, weakening them. But, what has to be noted is:

(1) The increased output would not have been forthcoming without the increased purchasing power from abroad.

(2) It is an impossibility for every country to have "external payments balances": one country's

balance is another's deficit. Moreover, the competition for exports balances leads to disastrous consequences. For, to quote a leader in *The Times* in 1940: "Beyond doubt one of the fundamental causes of this war has been the unrelaxing efforts of Germany since 1918 to secure wide enough markets at the very same time as her competitors were forced to adopt the same course."

You say: "Such a strong and competitive industrial base is the aim of Government policy." So, Mr. Harrison, you, as Government spokesman, are admitting that the Government is embarking on an economic policy which has been demonstrated beyond any doubt as one of the fundamental causes of war. And they are doing it at a time when war would be unspeakable horrendous.

Your confusion of mind is highlighted in the last sentence of your letter. The dictionary meaning of 'borrow' is "get temporary use of", but you refer to "increased Government *borrowing* on a *non-repayable* and interest-free basis". If it is not repayable, it is not borrowed.

4. *Your fourth admission:* On page 2 of your letter you say: "For too long industry has believed that Government could pull it out of the recession simply by manipulating demand. Experience of the 1960s and 1970s has shown that this is of little use." The "demand" during those years was *repayable* bank credit, the supply of which was manipulated up and down through alternate credit squeezes and credit expansion. That is just what we have been saying, Mr. Harrison, with the agreement of all accountants; namely, that it is the *repayment* of bank credit which pushes up prices. This happens because the money to repay it comes from consumers by charging them higher prices.

We can, therefore, sum up the position — *based on your admissions:*

U.K. during 1960s and 1970s — consumer purchasing power temporarily augmented by *repayable* bank credit. *Result:* High inflation; output relatively low.

West Germany, Japan and Switzerland — substantial increase in purchasing power from *non-repayable* external payments balances. *Result:* Low inflation; high output.

Yours faithfully, John Mitchell (Chairman, National Campaign Against Inflation; Chief Executive Member, Our Country, Our Credit Group).

ANOTHER VIEW OF DR. STRASSER

In view of some adverse comments that have been published recently about the Strasser brothers, there are certain facts about Dr. Otto Strasser which this journal believes should be placed on record.

Otto Strasser has been criticised for his radical economic views — he left the National Socialist Party before it attained power firmly convinced that Hitler was prepared to sacrifice the "left-wing" economic policies of his movement in order to secure the support of German industrialists and land-owners — and for subsequently directing a small propaganda campaign against the German dictator. Anyone who has read Douglas Reed's sympathetic portrait of Strasser in the book *Nemesis* must surely appreciate that there is much in his platform that provides a fruitful source for patriots today seeking to articulate a coherent economic and social doctrine which stands equally apart from the *laissez-faire* policies of free-market capitalism and the drab collectivism of Marxist socialism. As for any complaint about Strasser's activities against Hitler, it might seem strange to those of us who count ourselves as *British* nationalists that loyalty to Hitler should be recommended as the true measure of a man! Who can fail to be surprised that he took the action he did in view of the fact that the Nazi leader murdered his brother Gregor and placed a million marks on his own head?

For years after the war, Dr. Strasser was subject to persecution because of his expert knowledge of the international financial set-up and his desire to expose it. Indeed, for ten years the Canadian, U.S., British and German governments were in a conspiracy to keep him from his native land. A. K. Chesterton, who was a personal friend of Strasser, regarded him as a greatly-wronged man. He wrote this about him in 1954: "He has denounced International Jewish Finance and its incessant striving to enslave mankind either through Debt or through Communism. That is his major wickedness. His lesser, but still considerable, sin lies in the fact that, while deploring every Nazi abomination, he has torn to tatters the legend of the six million Jews done to death in gas-chambers by proving that only a small fraction of that number were ever in Hitler's power." There could scarcely be more convincing evidence of the worth of many of Dr. Strasser's views.

THE SERVILE STATE by HILAIRE BELLOC

THE CURSE OF THE INDUSTRIAL SYSTEM

In our first extract from Belloc's work, we saw the decline from Distributive property to Capitalism as a result of the confiscation of monastic land and its capture by an oligarchy of wealthy land-owners. The second part shows how modern industry in England has grown in a Capitalist mould.

In an England already cursed with a very large proletariat class, and in an England already directed by a dominating Capitalist class, possessing the means of production, there came a great industrial development. Had that industrial development come upon a people economically free, it would have taken a co-operative form. Coming as it did upon a people which had already largely lost its economic freedom, it took at its very origin a Capitalist form, and this form it has retained, expanded and perfected throughout two hundred years . . .

It was in 1705 that the first practical steam-engine, Newcomen's, was set to work. The life of a man elapsed before this invention was made, by Watt's introduction of the condenser, into the great instrument of production which has transformed our industry — but in those sixty years all the origins of the Industrial System are to be discovered . . . What was the characteristic mark of that half-century and more? Why did the new inventions give us the form of society now known and hated under the name of Industrial? Why did the vast increase in the powers of production, in population and in accumulation of wealth, turn the mass of Englishmen into a poverty-stricken proletariat, cut off the rich from the rest of the nation, and develop to the full all the evils which we associate with the Capitalist State?

To that question an answer almost as universal as it is unintelligent has been given . . . The answer so provided in innumerable text-books, and taken almost as a commonplace in our universities, is that the new methods of production — the new machinery, the new implements — fatally and of themselves developed a Capitalist State in which a few should own the means of production and the mass should be proletariat. The new instruments, it is pointed out, were on so vastly greater a scale than the old, and were so much more expensive, that the small man could not afford them; while the rich man, who could afford them, ate up by his own competition, and reduced from the position of a small owner to that of a wage-earner, his insufficiently equipped competitor who still attempted to struggle on with the older and cheaper tools. To this (we are told) the advantages of concentration were added in favour of the large owner against the small. Not only were the new instruments expensive almost in proportion to their efficiency, but, especially after the introduction of steam, they were efficient in proportion to their concentration in few places and under the direction of a few men. Under the effect of such false arguments as these we have been taught to believe that the horrors of the Industrial System were a blind and necessary produce of material and impersonal forces, and that wherever the steam engine, the power loom, the blast furnace and the rest were introduced, there fatally would soon appear a little group of owners exploiting a vast majority of the dispossessed.

Unhistorical Statement

It is astonishing that a statement so unhistorical should have gained so general a credence . . . The vast growth of the proletariat, the concentration of ownership into the hands of a few owners, and the exploitation by those owners of the mass of the community, had no fatal or necessary connection with the discovery of new and perpetually improving methods of production. The evil proceeded in direct historical sequence, proceeded patiently and demonstrably, from the fact that England, the seed-plot of the Industrial System, was *already* captured by a wealthy oligarchy *before* the series of great discoveries began . . . The England upon which the new discoveries had come was *already* an England owned as to its soil and accumulations of wealth by a small minority: it was *already* an England in which perhaps half of the whole population was proletarian, and a medium for exploitation ready to hand.

When any one of the new industries was launched it had to be capitalised; that is, accumulated wealth from some source or other had to be found which would support labour in the process of production until that process should be complete. Someone must find the corn and the meat and the housing and the clothing by which should be supported, between the extraction of the raw material and the moment when the consumption of the finished article could begin, the human agents which dealt with that raw material and turned it into the finished product. Had property been well distributed, protected by co-operative guilds fenced round and supported by custom and by the autonomy of great artisan corporations, those accumulations of wealth, necessary for the launching of each new method of production and for each new perfection of it, would have been discovered in the mass of small owners. *Their* corporations, *their*

little parcels of wealth combined would have furnished the capitalisation required for the new processes, and men already owners would, as one invention succeeded another, have increased the total wealth of the community without disturbing the balance of distribution. There is no conceivable link in reason or in experience which binds the capitalisation of a new process with the idea of a few employing owners and a mass of employed non-owners working at a wage. Such great discoveries coming in a society like that of the thirteenth century would have blest and enriched mankind. Coming upon the diseased moral conditions of the eighteenth century in this country, they proved a curse.

To whom could the new industry turn for capitalisation? The small owner had already largely disappeared. The corporate life and mutual obligations which had supported him and confirmed him in his property had been broken to pieces by no "economic development," but by the deliberate action of the rich. He was ignorant because his schools had been taken from him and the universities closed to him. He was the more ignorant because the common life which once nourished his social sense and the co-operative arrangements which had once been his defence had disappeared. When you sought an accumulation of corn, of clothing, of housing, of fuel as the indispensable preliminary to the launching of your new industry; when you looked round for someone who could find the accumulated wealth necessary for these considerable experiments, you had to turn to the class which had already monopolised the bulk of the means of production in England. The rich men alone could furnish you with those supplies.

Nor was this all. The supplies once found and the adventure "capitalised", that form of human energy which lay best to hand, which was indefinitely exploitable, weak, ignorant and desperately necessitous, ready to produce for you upon almost any terms, and glad enough if you would only keep it alive, was the existing proletariat which the new plutocracy had created when, in cornering the wealth of the country after the Reformation, they had thrust out the mass of Englishmen from the possession of implements, of houses, and of land.

The rich class, adopting some new process of production for its private gain, worked it upon those lines or mere competition which its avarice had already established. Co-operative tradition was dead. Where would it find its cheapest labour? Obviously among the proletariat — not among the remaining small owners. What class would increase under the new wealth? Obviously the proletariat again, without responsibilities, with nothing to leave to its progeny; and as they swelled the capitalist's gain, they enabled him with increasing power to buy out the small owner and send him to swell by another tributary the proletarian mass.

Unmixed Curse

It was upon this account that the Industrial Revolution, as it is called, took in its very origins the form which has made it an almost unmixed curse for the unhappy society in which it has flourished. The rich, already possessed of the accumulations by which that industrial change could alone be nourished, inherited all its succeeding accumulations of implements and all its increasing accumulations of subsistence. The factory system, starting upon a basis of capitalist and proletariat, grew in the mould which had determined its origins, With every new advance the capitalist looked for proletariat grist to feed the productive mill. Every circumstance of that society, the form in which the laws that governed ownership and profit were cast, the obligations of partners, the relations between "master" and "man", directly made for the indefinite expansion of a subject, formless, wage-earning class controlled by a small body of owners, which body would tend to become smaller and richer still, and to be possessed of power over greater and greater as the bad business unfolded.

The spread of economic oligarchy was everywhere, and not in industry alone. The great landlords destroyed deliberately and of set purpose and to their own advantage the common rights over common land. The small plutocracy with which they were knit up, and with whose mercantile elements they were now fused, directed everything to its own ends. That strong central government which should protect the community against the rapacity of a few had gone generations before. Capitalism triumphant wielded all the mechanism of legislation and of information too. It still holds them; and there is not an example of so-called "Social Reform" today which is not demonstrably (though often subconsciously) directed to the further entrenchment and confirmation of an industrial society in which it is taken for granted that a few shall own, that the vast majority shall live at a wage under them, and that all the bulk of Englishmen may hope for is the amelioration of their lot by regulations and by control from above — but not by property; not by freedom.

To be continued.

Read LIVERPOOL NEWSLETTER. Edited by Anthony Cooney. Sample copy 25p. from Rose Cottage, 17 Hadassah Grove, Liverpool L17 8XH.

NUCLEAR TARGET

(published in the Daily Telegraph, 27/10/81)

At a recent meeting in Cheltenham a speaker advocated the complete nuclear disarmament of Britain. Although he supported the retention and even the strengthening of our conventional defences, he accepted that they would prove inadequate to stave off a Russian invasion and occupation of Britain. He did not point out one logical sequel: the setting up of a string of nuclear bases along the west of Britain, an obvious target for American nuclear attack. The Russian mainland, being at a considerable distance from these targets, could escape unscathed. This position might encourage Russia to feel less need for caution before taking action likely to trigger off nuclear war against the United States. The abandonment of our nuclear deterrent might not lead only to defeat in a conventional war, but increase the chances of a subsequent nuclear war in which Britain would be more vulnerable than at present to nuclear devastation. It is as well for the public to be aware of the madness of giving in to pressures from the disarmament lobby.

R. D. MOLESWORTH,
Cheltenham, Glos.

SEARCHLIGHT OFF-BEAM

Candour's Editor was delighted to find herself the object of some intemperate spume flicked from the pen of a *Searchlight* hack concerning her alleged involvement in British Resistance, which uses Forest House as a forwarding address for mail. *Searchlight* is notorious for publishing stories which are five per cent true and 95 per cent *unintelligent* guesswork, fervid imagination and sheer damned nonsense, and the feature on Rosine ran true to form, creating an image of some guerrilla force lurking in the depths of the Forest House estate! Had one of *Searchlight's* grubby photographers snapped the double-decker bus, owned by a friend, which is sometimes parked in the drive, doubtless it would have been captioned as standing in readiness to transport Resistance shock-troops to the nearest point of civil commotion!

SUBSCRIPTION RATES

Subscribe Today !

U.K.	£4.00
Overseas airmail	£4.50
U.S.A. Dollar Rate	$10.00

Forest House, Liss Forest, Hants GU33 7DD

OLD TYME DANCING

Jenkins the Jobber
Erstwhile the Lobber
Of brickbats from Brussels, E.C.
Who declared it a fetish
His claim to be British
With Europe his priority.

Jenkins the Dodder
The Cross-Channel Plodder
The high-priest of economy
From Brussels he's back
On his satellite track
With his prize from the Community.

Jenkins the Bobber
The Socialist Sobber
Which lot now he rates second-class
So he makes S.D.P.
With a small gang of three
And the Liberals holding the pass.

The malleable Steele
Brought neatly to heel
The host with the ghost of a chance
With Jenkins to dinner
The Liberals get thinner
Trimmed for the idiot dance.

There are 'wets', there are 'drips'
Those who disregard Whips
In the fraud and the farce politik
Now allied they be
The Soon Dry Party
For the voters so young — or so thick.

And proving the point
These at Crosby anoint
The poll with the said S.D.P.
Thus, in a new guise
The political lies
Are the same — but with different gravy.

B. E. BIGGS.

It is intended to launch a Catholic (Roman and Anglican) poetry magazine, DOWRY, this spring. Interested readers are invited to send an s.a.e. to Mr. A. MacAndrew, 19 Grosvenor Drive, New Brighton, Wallasey, Merseyside.

READ JEAN OUSSET'S "ACTION". The essential handbook for all activists seeking guidance on the strategy and tactics to use in defending their beliefs. Only £3.50 from Candour Publishing Co.

Published by Candour Publishing Co. (Editor: R. de Bounevialle), Forest House. Liss Forest and Printed by Farnham Printing Co. Ltd.